



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,174	10/06/2000	Mark Morelli	00-623	1693

7590 02/23/2007
Bachman & Lapointe P C
Suite 1201
900 Chapel Street
New Haven, CT 06510-2802

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HUY D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2617

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/684,174

Applicant(s)

MORELLI ET AL.

Examiner

Huy D. Nguyen

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ausems et al. (US 6,434,403 B1) in view of Pope (US 5,963,624).

Regarding claims 1, 15-17, Ausems et al. teaches a PDA telephone (e.g., PDA telephone 100) configured to remotely control appliances, heating, air conditioning system...using either wireless telephone engine 210 or short range transceiver 265 (see column 9, lines 1-9). Ausems et al. does not clearly teach communicating a structural appliance with a server programmed to accept mobile device commands; communicating a mobile device with server; issuing mobile device commands from mobile device to server; converting mobile device commands to structural appliance commands; and issuing structural appliance commands from server to structural appliance. In the same field of endeavor, the preceding limitations are taught in Pope (see Figs. 1 and 5; see column 2, lines 45-60, column 5, lines 14-33, column 3, lines 35-41, column 4, lines 17-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

Art Unit: 2617

of the invention to apply the teaching of Pope to the teaching of Ausems et al. to allow control information to be multiplexed with the voice data and to reduce transmission error.

Regarding claim 2, Pope teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein said server is communicated with said structural appliance through a gateway (e.g., window 36 – see figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Pope to the teaching of Ausems et al. to allow control information to be multiplexed with the voice data and to reduce transmission error.

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Ausems et al. and Pope teaches the method according to claim 2, further comprising the steps of: storing structural appliance information at one of said structural appliance, said gateway and said server; and transmitting said structural appliance information from said server to said mobile device (see column 4, lines 55-57).

Regarding claim 5, Ausems et al. discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein structural appliance information comprises at least one type of information selected from the group consisting of diagnostic information, maintenance information, operating parameters, environmental information and combinations thereof (see Ausems et al.: Col. 9, line 15).

Regarding claim 6, Ausems et al. teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein said structural appliance is selected from the group consisting of heating, ventilation, air conditioning, refrigeration, building control and elevator appliances (e.g., PDA telephone 100 may be configured to remotely control audio/video appliances, automobile door locks, garage door openers, home alarm systems, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems, etc. – column 9, lines 5-9).

Regarding claim 7, Ausems et al. discloses that mobile device is a web-enabled device (see Ausems et al.: Col. 1, line 26).

Regarding claims 8, 11, since PDA telephone 100 is a wireless device, it is inherent that it uses wireless application protocol.

Regarding claims 9-10, the examiner takes official notice that global satellite network and global computer network are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use global satellite network and global computer network to extend the range of operation.

Regarding claim 12, Ausems et al. discloses display 145 for displaying information to user (see Ausems et al.: Col. 4, lines 21-22).

Regarding claim 13, Ausems et al. teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein said mobile device is communicated with said server from a remote location (e.g., PDA telephone 100 may be configured to remotely control audio/video appliances, automobile door locks, garage door openers, home alarm systems, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems, etc. – column 9, lines 5-9; wireless phone engine 210 includes long range transceiver – see column 5, line 59).

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Ausems et al. and Pope teaches the method according to claim 13, wherein said server is a wireless-accessible server (see Pope: Fig. 1; column 5, lines 21-22).

Regarding claim 18, Ausems et al. discloses the claimed invention except that the mobile device is operated by an energy provider. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have the mobile device being operated by an energy provider or any provider, since it does not

solves any problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the mobile device operated by any provider.

Regarding claim 19, it is inherent that to control the appliances using the PDA 100, a selection of appliances is present on the PDA.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Contact Information


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7845. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Huy D Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2617


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER